



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/592,758	06/13/2000	TIMOTHY L. POWERS	CE03958R	5788

22917 7590 05/06/2003

MOTOROLA, INC.
1303 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD
IL01/3RD
SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196

EXAMINER

WARD, RONALD J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2681

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/592,758

Applicant(s)

POWERS ET AL.

Examiner

Ronald J Ward

Art Unit

2681

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-9, 11, 12, 14-16, 18 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10, 13, 17 and 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see pages 3-5, filed January 21, 2003, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Harris (USPN 5946373).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. **Claims 7-9, 11, 14-16, 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Harris (USPN 5946373).

As to **claim 7**, Harris discloses a method for reducing the number of event notifications sent to an Operations and Maintenance Center (OMC) (100 in Fig. 1) by a network element (107) serviced by the OMC, the method comprising the steps of:

filtering event notifications to provide a plurality of filtered event notifications, wherein each event notification of the plurality of event notifications notifies of a different event (see col. 4 lines 9-14 and col. 6 lines 5-40, wherein fault alarms for different circuits or trunks are equivalent to "different event[s]");

counting the plurality of filtered event notifications to generate event count information from the filtered event notifications (see col. 7 lines 60-64, see step 244 in Fig. 2D);

conveying an alarm to the OMC if the event count information exceeds a threshold (see col. 8 line 35 through col. 9 line 5, see step 246 in Fig. 2D).

As to **claim 8**, Harris discloses everything as applied to claim 7 above. In addition, Harris discloses that the step of filtering event notifications comprises the steps of:

receiving the event notifications (step 203 in Figure 2B); and

selecting the event notifications based on selection criteria to provide filtered event notifications (see step 213 in Figure 2B, see also col. 6 lines 16-20).

As to **claim 9**, Harris discloses everything as applied to claim 7 above. In addition, Harris discloses that the step of counting the event notifications comprises the steps of:

receiving filtered event notifications (see step 244 in Fig. 2D, which occurs after several filtering steps shown in Fig. 2C and step 241 in Fig. 2D);

incrementing an event count based on performance measurement definitions for each of the filtered event notifications (see step 244 in Fig. 2D)

establishing event count information specific to each of the filtered event notifications based on event count criteria (see col. 8 lines 47-52, wherein time limits are suggested as event count criteria).

As to **claim 11**, Harris discloses everything as applied to claim 7 above. In addition, Harris discloses that the OMC (100) establishes criteria for selection of event notifications (see col. 6 lines 16-20, wherein it is disclosed that a system user may define inference engine rules,

and col. 3 lines 57-58 discloses that the OMC is the user fault alarm display and control command interface).

As to **claim 14**, Harris discloses an apparatus for reducing the number of event notifications sent to an Operations and Maintenance Center (OMC) (100) by a network element (107) serviced by the OMC comprising:

means for filtering to provide a plurality of filtered event notifications, wherein each event notification of the plurality of event notifications notifies of a different event (see col. 4 lines 9-14 and col. 6 lines 5-40, wherein fault alarms for different circuits or trunks are equivalent to “different event[s]”);

means for counting to generate event count information from the plurality of filtered event notifications (see col. 7 lines 60-64, see step 244 in Fig. 2D);

means for conveying alarms to the OMC based on the event count information (see col. 3 lines 57-58 and see col. 8 line 35 through col. 9 line 5, see also step 246 in Fig. 2D).

As to **claim 15**, Harris discloses everything as applied to claim 14 above. In addition, Harris discloses that the filtering means comprises:

means for receiving the event notifications (step 203 in Figure 2B); and

means for selecting the event notifications based on filtering criteria to provide filtered event notifications (see step 213 in Figure 2B, see also col. 6 lines 16-20).

As to **claim 16**, Harris discloses everything as applied to claim 14 above. In addition, Harris discloses that the counting means comprises:

means for receiving filtered event notifications from the filtering means (see step 244 in Fig. 2D, which occurs after several filtering steps shown in Fig. 2C and step 241 in Fig. 2D);

means for incrementing an event count based on performance measurement definitions for each of the filtered event notifications (see step 244 in Fig. 2D)

means for establishing event count information specific to each of the filtered event notifications based on event count criteria (see col. 8 lines 47-52, wherein time limits are taught and are equivalent to “event count criteria”, as claimed).

As to **claim 18**, Harris discloses everything as applied to claim 14 above. In addition, Harris discloses that the OMC (100) establishes criteria for the filtering means (see col. 6 lines 16-20, wherein it is disclosed that a system user may define inference engine rules, and col. 3 lines 57-58 discloses that the OMC is the user fault alarm display and control command interface).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 12 and 19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris (USPN 5946373) in view of Dowden et al (USPN 5923247).

As to **claim 12**, Harris discloses everything as applied to claim 7 above. In addition, Harris discloses the creation of event counter objects (inference engine rules such as time limits are considered equivalent to “objects” as broadly claimed) having information on thresholding and alarm notification (see col. 6 lines 16-20 and col. 8 lines 35-52 and col. 3 lines 57-58 discloses that the OMC is the user fault alarm display and control command interface).

However, Harris fails to explicitly recite that the OMC requests creation of the event counter objects.

In an analogous art, Dowden et al. discloses an event filtering system having an OMC (20 in Fig. 2) that requests a user to create event counter objects (see col. 5 lines 11-20 and col. 7 lines 1-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Harris's OMC to request creation of the event counter objects, as taught by Dowden. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification because it allows the user have greater control over how many false inferences will be made (see col. 47-52).

As to **claim 19**, Harris discloses everything as applied to claim 14 above. In addition, Harris discloses the creation of event count criteria (inference engine rules such as time limits) for the counting means (see col. 6 lines 16-20 and col. 8 lines 47-52).

However, Harris fails to explicitly recite that the OMC requests creation of the event count criteria.

In an analogous art, Dowden et al. discloses an event filtering system having an OMC (20 in Fig. 2) that requests a user to create event count criteria (see col. 5 lines 11-20 and col. 7 lines 1-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Harris's OMC to request creation of the event count criteria, as taught by Dowden. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification

Art Unit: 2681

because it allows the user have greater control over how many false inferences will be made (see col. 47-52).

Allowable Subject Matter

6. **Claims 1-6** are allowed.

7. **Claims 10, 13, 17, and 20** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

As to **claim 1**, Harris's filter receives event notifications from processes outside the Fault Management System, as opposed to delegating the filtering function to the respective network elements that produce the different event notifications, as claimed. Thus, the prior art fails to disclose or render obvious a system for reducing congestion in an OMC, as claimed, comprising a network element that comprises a filter receiving event notifications from processes **within** the network element.

Claims 2-6 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on base claim 1.

As to **claims 10 and 17**, Harris discloses everything as applied to claims 7 and 14 above. In addition, Harris discloses that the step of emitting an alarm when the event count exceeds a threshold comprises the steps of:

comparing the event count information against a threshold (see col. 8 lines 35-47)

emitting an alarm to the OMC if the event count information exceeds the threshold (see col. 8 lines 40-44 wherein an inferred outage is considered equivalent to an alarm, see also col. 10 lines 9-10, wherein it is disclosed that inferred outages are reported, i.e. emitted)

However, the prior art fails to disclose or render obvious the event notification method as claimed wherein the step of emitting an alarm when the event count exceeds a threshold comprises the step of resetting the event count information if an alarm is emitted to the OMC.

As to claim 12, the prior art fails to disclose or render obvious the event notification method as claimed wherein the OMC requests creation of event counter objects having information on the thresholding and alarm notification.

As to **claims 13 and 20**, the prior art fails to disclose or render obvious the event notification method or apparatus as claimed wherein a group of event notifications may be selected and counted as one event.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Halkio (U.S. Patent Number 5,917,886) discloses a system for reducing congestion in an interconnection network monitoring system, the monitoring system comprising:

a filter (1 in Fig. 2) receiving event notifications from processes (L1-L3) and providing a plurality of event notifications, wherein each event notification of the plurality of event notifications notifies of a different event (see col. 3 lines 30-40);

an event counter module (C1-C3) coupled to the filter for receiving the plurality of event notifications from the filter and counting a quantity of event notifications to produce event counter information (see col. 3 lines 41-57);

Art Unit: 2681

a performance measurement module (1 and 3) coupled to the event counter module for receiving the event counter information from the event counter module and sending alarms to the operator (see col. 3 lines 58-65).

Halkio's event counter module counts event notifications, however, Halkio fails to explicitly recite that the counter module counts **filtered** event notifications.

Cohen et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,477,585) discloses an invention whose object is "to filter events generated by one or more event suppliers to determine whether particular events are communicated to one or more consumers." However, Cohen fails to explicitly recite counting the filtered events.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald J. Ward whose telephone number is (703) 305-5616. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dwayne Bost, can be reached at (703)305-4778.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office at (703) 306-0377.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (Technology Center 2600 only)

Art Unit: 2681

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

RJW

April 22, 2003



DWAYNE BOST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600